



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/841,950	04/08/1997	MARK D. RIGGINS	40827.00004	3712

7590

04/21/2004

Jinntung Su
MANATT, PHELPS LLP
1001 Page Mill Road
Building 2
Palo Alto, CA 94203

EXAMINER

SEAL, JAMES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

52

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

52

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/841,950

Applicant(s)

RIGGINS, MARK D.

Examiner

James Seal

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 8-14, 16-20, 22-30 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 8-14, 16-20, 22-30, and 32-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to applicant's correspondence of 04 February 2004.
2. Amended claims 5-6, 8, 10, 19-20, 22, 29, 30, 32, 37 and 38 have been entered.
3. Claims 2-6, 8-14, 16-20, 22-30 and 32-39 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 2-6, 8-14, 16-30, and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vogel (5,815,683 A), and further in view of Rosenow et. al. (US 5483596 A), Montague et. al. (US 5675782 A), and Pilc et. al. (US 5510777 A)
5. Claim 1 has been cancelled.
6. As per amended claim 6, the limitations of a communication system linking client with web server is disclosed by Vogler Figure 1, elements 16 that is the Internet is the network that supports the world wide web). The further limitations, that security services are coupled to the web server, which determine access and authentication of the client determining client's remote privileges (Figure 2, element 18, 20, and 22) as well as enabling client to select among *different* (other) services (via a Browser (e.g. Netscape Navigator or later Column 4, lines 18-19); figure 4 elements 44, 42, and 46, and Column 1, lines 37-40; column 4 lines 9-19) for example CAD tools communication services, etc, Column 1, lines 37-40) is disclosed by Vogel. Vogel discloses one user authentication per request for service (for example a CAD problem) and is silent on presenting the user with a plurality of user authentication protocol options, each user authentication protocol option having a particular level of authentication associated with it for authenticating the user according to at least one user authentication protocol.

Art Unit: 2135

Montague, however, discloses presenting the user with a plurality of services for remote access and the use of user access rights with respect to applications which are controlled (Figure 2 and Column 3, lines 9-26). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the system of Vogel's with that of Montague because most users require flexibility especially in engineering designed, that is the use of CAD and expert program and with a number of services provided to the user, comes the need for access control and digital rights management. Vogel/Montague are silent on the issue for the need of additional authentication which may vary for the access required. Pilc et. al. disclose a system which uses additional authentication which depends on the level of additional security for the particular request (Column 2, lines 19-30). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Vogel/Montague with the teachings of Pilc as the additional services of Montague would entail additional limitations of resources and security and this would be provided by Pilc. Although Vogel's facilitator provides to the client service communications code that enables communication with a selected service (Figure 1, elements 14 (host engine), 12 and 10) Vogel is silent on whether these services are coupled to the security services or the use of keys stored in a secure memory (key safe) at the host that enable the client to access the available services without storing service communication codes and keys at the client.

7. Rosenow provides a secure system for accessing files over a switched network for (figure 1, elements 46, 12, and 50 and figure 2), using resource authorization keys and access on the access controller (Figure 2, element 48 and Column 4, lines 47-55).

Thus Rosenow authorization keys and resources are located at the server and would be of necessity held in a secure memory (key safe) at that site. Thus Rosenow when combined with Vogel would provide the details of security needed by Vogel. Claim 6 is rejected.

8. Claim 7 is cancelled.

11. Claims 2-5 and claims 8-14 are dependent on claim 6. The limitations brought by claims 2 (SSL), 3 (encryption protocol), 4 (public key encryption) and 5 (public key certificates to authenticate) are well known methods for secure communications over a network and are well known in the cryptologic arts. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Vogel/ Montague Pilc/Rosenow, as necessary methods for implementing a secure network.

9. Claims 8-14 are also dependent on claims 6, the limitations of claims 11 (firewalls) and claim 14 (proxy) are well known in the network security arts and would be implemented on any system which carried secure information across a network. Claim 8 relates to the determination of privileges of the user(see Column 3, lines 9-45 Montague), claims 10 the limitation of authentication information (pilc, Column 2, lines 19-30) and the use of codes to negotiate devices claims 9, 12, 13, and 14 (see Rosenow Abstract)). Claims 2-5 and 8-14 are rejected.

12. Claim 15 has been cancelled.

13. Claims 20, consist of a computer based method for implementing 6 and is rejected by the same prior art of record. Claim 20 is rejected.

10. Claim 21 is cancelled.

11. As per dependent claims 16-19, 22-28, these address a computer-based method address by claims 2-5, 8-14 and are rejected in view of the same art.

12. Claim 29 now recites a server computer system. Such variations are disclosed by Vogel (Column 2, lines 63-67). Claim 29 is rejected.

13. Claim 30 recites a computer based storage medium for implementing claim 6 and rejected in view of the same prior art of record. Claim 30 is rejected.

14. Claim 31 cancelled.

15. Claim 32 is a method for receiving the data in an advanced communication and secured network to implement claim 6 and is rejected by the same prior art of record. Claim 32 rejected.

16. Claims 33-36 are dependent on claim 32 and recite the association of keys with services and determination of client privileges using stored information see especially Rosenow, claims 10-11.

17. Claim 37 recites a system plus means for the communication system recited in claim 32. Claim 37 is rejected.

18. As per claim 38 recites a computer readable storage medium for the communication system claimed in claim 32. Claim 38 rejected.

19. As per claim 39, is a server computer system (for communicating, security, access control and providing services) and web server (for presenting information to user) for implementing the system with the limitations recited in claim 6 and is rejected in view of the same prior art of record.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 04 February 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 6, 20, 29, 30, 32, and 37, 38 and 39 are independent. As per claim 6 the security services presenting to user a plurality of authenticated protocol options is disclosed by the Vogel/Rosenow combination. Vogel suggest one group of services CAD programs, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added any and all over computer services that the client might need such as graphics programs, expert programs, accounting programs etc. in order to meet the needs of a user. Again Rosenow provide authentication of services which would be necessary with a multiservice provider. Each authentication is associated with a security level is

disclosed by Pilc. This would be needed if for example company proprietary data with different security levels would require authentication to different levels.

As per claim 20, presenting to user a plurality of protocols and codes and key storage is disclosed by Rosenow and authentication levels Piic and Vogel the services.

As per claim 29, plurality of user authentication protocol options is disclosed by Vogel/Rosenow and levels by Pilc and keys with privileges disclosed by Montague/Rosenow. Note Vogel with Montague requests provide a means of providing a flexible service request.

As per Claim 30, plurality of authentication protocol options is disclosed by Vogel/Rosenow and the authentication protocol association with different levels, retrieval of keys in secure memory from Rosenow each corresponding to a service is Vogel.

As per claim 32, storing security information at a location remote from site is disclosed by Pilc and Rosenow combination and providing services without requiring user to supply of information would be a consequence of the Pilc and Rosenow with Vogel combination.

As per claim 37, storing the security information at a location remote from the client, is disclosed by Pilc and Rosenow, and without requiring the user to supply information would be a consequence of the Pilc and Rosenow with Vogel combination.

As per claim 38, storing security information at a location remote from the client is disclosed by Pilc and Rosenow, and without requiring the user to supply information would be a consequence of the Pilc and Rosenow with Vogel Combination.

As per claim 39, security services (Vogel) presenting a user with a plurality of authentication protocol option is disclose by Rosenow, each protocol option having a particular level of authentication associated with it is disclosed by Pilc, determining users rights and privileges is based on the level of authentication and identity of user is disclosed by Montague/ Pilc combination.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Seal whose telephone number is 703 308 4562. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703 305 4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWS
Jws

